

REMARKS

Examiner's comments in the Office Action dated October 1, 2003 have been carefully considered by Applicant. Claims 1 through 20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 16, 17, 18, and 19 are amended. In making such amendments, Applicant maintains that no new matter has been introduced into the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration by Examiner.

Claims 6, 9 and 12 stand objected to because of informalities. Claim 6 is amended to properly depend from claim 5. Claims 9 and 12 are amended to have proper antecedent basis, which should explain each claims dependency upon claim 8 as respectfully requested by Examiner.

Claim 9 is a further limitation and is dependent upon claim 8. Claim 8 requires determining a warning status signal in response to said plurality of pressure status signals. Whereas, claim 9 limits claim 8 by requiring determining a warning status signal comprises qualifying the plurality of pressure status signals by generating the warning status signal in response to a predetermined number of said plurality of pressure status signal being equal. Specifically in claim 9, the warning status signal is based upon having a predetermined number of the plurality of pressure status signals that are equal. Reference may be made to paragraph 47 and Figure 6 in the specification.

Claim 12 is a further limitation and is dependent upon claim 8. Claim 8 requires determining a warning status signal in response to said plurality of pressure status signals. Whereas, claim 12 limits claim 8 by requiring determining a warning status signal comprises generating a first warning status signal in response to a predetermined number of said pressure status signals being equal within a predetermined time. Specifically in claim 12, the warning status signal is based upon having a predetermined number of the plurality of pressure status signals that are equal within a predetermined time. Reference may be made to paragraph 47 and Figure 6 in the specification.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 1 is amended to have proper antecedent basis. Claims 16, 17 and 18 are

amended and are now definite without adding new matter. Also, claim 19 is amended deleting the duplicated words "in response."

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Juzswik et al.* (6,612,165). Applicant submits that the present claims are novel because the present device and the cited art differ.

Claim 1 requires a controller coupled to said pressure transmitter, said controller receiving said pressure signal and in a first stage, comparing the pressure signal to a pressure threshold to obtain a sensor status and in a second stage, qualifying the sensor status signal by generating a warning status in response to said sensor status. The *Juzswik* system is a tire pressure monitoring system with pressure gauge operating mode for indication when air pressure within a tire is within a predetermined pressure range. The *Juzswik* reference does not teach or suggest in a first stage, comparing the pressure signal to a pressure threshold to obtain a sensor status and in a second stage, qualifying the sensor status signal by generating a warning status in response to said sensor status.

Claims 2-3 are novel for the reason set forth with respect to claim 1 and being a further limitation of claim 1. Claim 2 further recites the sensor status signal is an initial pressure signal and wherein said controller qualifies the initial sensor status signal by generating a low or flat warning status signal in response to said initial sensor status signal indicating a respective low or flat tire pressure. Claim 3 is dependent upon claim 2 and further recites when the status signal is not an initial status signal, qualifying the sensor status signal by receiving a plurality of equal sensor status signals.

Claims 4-7 are novel for the reason set forth in claims 1-3. Further, claim 4 requires in a second stage, qualifying the sensor status signal by generating a warning status in response to said sensor status. The *Juzswik* reference does not teach or suggest a second stage, qualifying the sensor status signal by generating a warning status in response to said sensor status.

In the Office Action, claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Juzswik et al.* (6,612,165). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 8-14 are novel for the reasons stated in Claims 1-7, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn as *Juzswik* fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claims 8-14. Further, no reason has been shown why one of skill in the art would modify the *Juzswik* references as the Office Action proposes.

In the Office Action, claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Juzswik et al.* (6,612,165) in view of *Bezek et al.* (6,278,363). Applicant respectfully traverses. Claims 15-20 are novel for the reasons stated in Claims 1 and 8, respectively.

Furthermore, claim 15 requires comparing the plurality of pressure signals to a plurality of pressure thresholds to obtain a pressure status signal; and determining a composite warning signal in response to said high pressure warning status signal, said low pressure warning status signal, and said flat pressure status signal. Neither *Juzswik* or *Bezek* teach or suggest comparing the plurality of pressure signals to a plurality of pressure thresholds to obtain a pressure status signal; and determining a composite warning signal in response to said high pressure warning status signal, said low pressure warning status signal, and said flat pressure status signal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn as *Juzswik* fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claims 8-14. Further, no reason has been shown why one of skill in the art would modify the *Juzswik* or *Bezek* references as the Office Action proposes.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-20 are allowable and in a proper condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance indicating the same is therefore earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicant's undersigned attorney at (248) 223-9500 if any unresolved matters remain.

U.S.S.N. 10/064,688

- 9 -

201-1003 (FGT 1612 PA)

Respectfully Submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ P.C.



Kevin G. Mierzwa

Reg. No. 38,049

28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250

Southfield, MI 48034

(248) 223-9500

Dated: _____